

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested.  
Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Claims 1-8 stand rejected.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

In the final Office Action mailed February 18, 2005, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **de Hond** (USP 6,002,853) in view of **Towell et al.** (USP 6,647,411). For the reasons set forth in detail below, this rejection, to the extent that it is considered to apply to the presently amended claims, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the push-type information and the pull-type information input through the respective interfaces have different formats, while the summaries extracted from the inputted push-type information and the summaries of pull-type information downloaded by the summary download means are described in a predetermined common format. Support for the amendments to claim 1 is provided, e.g., on page 3, lines 1-9; page 6, lines 9-14; and page 9, lines 4-9 of the present application which describe that various types of information having different formats and different transmission methods (push, pull), which cannot be displayed on a common viewer, can be displayed together (claimed summary list display means) because they have a predetermined common format.

The combination of **de Hond** and **Towell et al.** does not disclose or suggest an information search and display apparatus wherein push-type information and pull-type information input through respective interfaces have different formats, while summaries of the

respective push-type information and pull-type information are described in a predetermined common format for display by a summary list display means.

Further, the patentability arguments set forth in the response filed May 18, 2005 are hereby incorporated by reference.

If the rejection is maintained, the Examiner is respectfully requested to address the arguments presented in the May 18, 2005 response because they are still applicable. More specifically, Applicants argued that there is no motivation to combine the references. The Advisory Action indicates that the motivation to combine the references exists because “**Towell** accounts for a pull-type format, and **de Hond** discloses the display of information not explicitly searched.” However, this addresses what the references teach individually, but does not indicate why one would be motivated to combine the references.

Further, in the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicates that “predetermination of format is *inherent* for the system to function properly.” Applicants respectfully disagree. First, it is submitted that the only way the format between the **de Hond** and **Towell et al.** references could be predetermined is if the inventors in those two references got together and decided what format they would use (i.e., predetermine the format). Second, inherency requires that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the invention. Applicants are entitled to require the Examiner to provide extrinsic evidence demonstrating that the missing descriptive matter would necessarily be present in the invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide extrinsic evidence that the predetermination of a format is inherent in the combination of references.

Finally, the Advisory Action indicates that the “single viewer question is still not a claimed limitation.” Although the claims do not use the term “viewer,” the claimed “summary list display means” displays summaries corresponding to information having different formats on the same display means. Thus, the “summary list display means” is a single viewer.

The Office Action further asserts that “Towell allows for the display of pull and push type information explicitly.” The Examiner is respectfully requested to point out where **Towell et al.** discloses displaying summaries of information having different formats, as presently claimed, on the same summary list display means.

For all the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1-8 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art and therefore define allowable subject matter.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.


Application No. 09/777,010  
Art Unit: 2145

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.114  
Attorney Docket No.: 010122

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William M. Schertler". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "William" being the most prominent part.

William M. Schertler  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 35,348  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/dlt